CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

PAGE 1 OF 14

JMA

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

27

28

Introduction

- 1. Pari Iranmanesh ("Plaintiff") brings this class action for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of Executive Financial Enterprises, Inc., and its related entities, subsidiaries and agents ("Defendant") in willfully employing and/or causing to be employed certain wire-tapping, eavesdropping, recording and listening equipment in order to record, monitor or listen to the telephone conversations of Plaintiff without the knowledge or consent of Plaintiff, in violation of California Penal Code §§ 630 et seq., thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to their own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including the investigation conducted by her attorneys.
- California Penal Code § 632 prohibits one party to a telephone call from 2. intentionally recording the conversation without the knowledge or consent of the other. Penal Code § 632 is violated the moment the recording is made without the consent of all parties thereto, regardless of whether it is subsequently disclosed. The only intent required by Penal Code § 632 is that the act of recording itself be done intentionally. There is no requisite intent on behalf of the party doing the surreptitious recording to break California or any other law, or to invade the privacy right of any other Plaintiff alleges that despite California's two-party consent rule, Defendant continues to violate Penal Code § 632 by impermissibly recording, monitoring, and/or eavesdropping its telephone upon conversations with California residents.
- 3. Plaintiff makes these allegations on information and belief, with the exception of those allegations that pertain to a plaintiff, or to a plaintiff's counsel, which Plaintiff alleges on personal knowledge.

8

9

10

11

1

2

3

4

5

12 13 14 15 16

20 21

17

18

19

23

22

24

25

26 27

28

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
- Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District 5. of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because Defendant does business within the State of California and the County of San Diego.

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, an individual citizen and resident of the State of California.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a professional corporation whose primary corporate address is in Beverly Hills, CA. Defendant has a policy and practice of recording and/or monitoring telephone conversations with the public, including California residents. Defendant's employees and agents are directed, trained and instructed to, and do, record, monitor, and/or eavesdrop upon telephone conversations with the public, including California residents.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a professional Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on the basis of that information and belief alleges, that at all times mentioned in this Complaint, Defendants were the agents and employees of their co-defendants, and in doing the things alleged in this Complaint, were acting within the course and scope of that agency and employment.
- At all times relevant, Plaintiff was an individual residing within the State of 9. California.
- 10. Since late 2011, Plaintiff had telephone communications with certain employees, officers and/or agents of Defendant. Each of these conversations

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

27

28

with Plaintiff was, surreptitiously and without knowledge or consent, recorded, monitored, and/or eavesdropped upon by Defendant, causing harm and damage to Plaintiff. At no time during these calls was Plaintiff ever informed that Plaintiff's telephone call were being monitored, recorded, and/or eavesdropped upon. At no time during these calls did Plaintiff give consent for the telephone calls to be monitored, recorded and/or eavesdropped upon.

- 11. Specifically, on or about November 29, 2011, Plaintiff contacted Defendant by telephone in order to inquire about an alleged debt that Defendant was collecting from Plaintiff. After speaking with Defendant for a considerable period of time, Plaintiff inquired as to whether the conversation was being recorded and Defendant responded for the first time that Defendant records all calls between Defendant and consumers.
- 12. During the relevant time period, Defendant has had a policy and a practice of recording and/or monitoring telephone conversations with consumers. Defendant's employees and agents are directed, trained and instructed to, and do, record, monitor, and/or eavesdrop upon telephone conversations with the public, including Plaintiff and other California residents.
- From the beginning of 2011 to the present, Defendant has installed and/or 13. caused to be installed certain wire-tapping, eavesdropping, and listening equipment in its employees' or agents' telephone lines. Defendant uses these devices to overhear, record, and listen to each and every telephone conversation on said telephone lines.
- 14. During the relevant time period, Defendant has had all of its calls to the public, including those made to California residents, recorded, monitored, and/or eavesdropped upon without the knowledge or consent of the public, including Plaintiff and other California residents.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

15. Defendant's conduct alleged herein constitutes violations of the right to privacy to the public, including Plaintiff and other California residents, and California Penal Code § 630 et seq.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others 16. similarly situated ("The Class").
- Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, "The Class" defined as follows: 17. "All persons in California whose inbound and outbound telephone conversations were monitored, recorded, eavesdropped upon and/or wiretapped without their consent by Defendant within one year prior to the filing of the original Complaint in this action."
- 18. Defendant, and its employees and agents are excluded from The Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believe this number to be in the tens of thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.
- This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic 19. injury on behalf of The Class and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand The Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.
- 20. The joinder of The Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties and to the Court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records.
- There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and 21. fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

2.5 26

27

28

and fact to The Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:

- policy of recording, a. Whether Defendant has wiretapping, a eavesdropping upon and/or monitoring incoming and/or outgoing calls;
- b. Whether Defendant discloses to callers and/or obtains their consent that their incoming and/or outgoing telephone conversations were being recorded, wiretapped, eavesdropped upon and/or monitored;
- c. Whether Defendant's policy of recording, wiretapping, eavesdropping upon and/or monitoring incoming and/or outgoing calls constituted a violation of California Penal Code §§ 631(a), 632(a) and/or 637;
- d. Whether Defendant's policy of recording, wiretapping, eavesdropping upon, and/or monitoring incoming and/or outgoing calls constitutes a violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq.;
- e. Whether Defendant's policy of recording, wiretapping, eavesdropping upon, and/or monitoring incoming and/or outgoing calls constitutes an invasion of privacy;
- f. Whether Plaintiff and The Class were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violations; and
- g. Whether Defendants should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 22. Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The Class because every other member of The Class, like Plaintiff, was exposed to virtually identical conduct and are entitled to the greater of statutory damages of \$5,000 per violation or three times actual damages per violation pursuant to Penal Code § 637.2(a).
- 23. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of The Class in that Plaintiff has no interest antagonistic to any member of The

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims to further ensure such protection.
- 24. Plaintiff and the members of The Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, The Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.
- 25. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal and California law. The interest of The Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.
- 26. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to The Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to The Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION INVASION OF PRIVACY: VIOLATION OF PENAL CODE § 630 ET SEQ.

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this 27. Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 28. Californians have a constitutional right to privacy. Moreover, the California Supreme Court has definitively linked the constitutionally protected right to privacy within the purpose, intent and specific protections of the Privacy Act, including specifically, Penal Code § 632. "In addition, California's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

27

28

explicit constitutional privacy provision (Cal. Const., 1 § 1) was enacted in
part specifically to protect California from overly intrusive business
practices that were seen to pose a significant and increasing threat to
personal privacy. (Citations omitted). Thus, Plaintiff believes that
California must be viewed as having a strong and continuing interest in the
full and vigorous application of the provisions of section 632 prohibiting the
recording of telephone conversations without the knowledge or consent of
all parties to the conversation.

- California Penal Code § 632 prohibits one party to a telephone call from 29. intentionally recording the conversation without the knowledge or consent of the other party. Penal Code § 632 is violated the moment the recording is made without the consent of all parties thereto, regardless of whether it is subsequently disclosed that the telephone call was recorded. The only intent required by Penal Code § 632 is that the act of recording itself be done intentionally. There is no requisite intent on behalf of the party doing the surreptitious recording to break California law or any other law, or to invade the privacy right of any other person.
- 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendant employed employed and/or caused be certain wire-tapping, to eavesdropping, recording, and listening equipment on the telephone lines of all employees, officers, directors, and managers of Defendant.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that all these devises 31. were maintained and utilized to overhear, record, and listen to each and every incoming and outgoing telephone conversation over said telephone lines.
- Said wire-tapping, listening, recording, and eavesdropping equipment was 32. used to record, monitor, or listen to the telephone conversations of Plaintiff

and the	members	of The	Class,	all in	violation	of	California	Penal	Code	§ §
631(a) a	and/or 632	.6(a).								

- 33. At no time during which these telephone conversations were taking place between Defendant or any employee, agent, manager, officer, or director of Defendant, and any other person, did Defendant inform Plaintiff or any other member of The Class that the interceptions, eavesdropping, wire-tapping, listening, and recording of their telephone conversations were taking place and at no time did Plaintiff or any other member of The Class consent to this activity.
- 34. Defendant, knowing that this conduct was unlawful and a violation of Plaintiff and the members of The Class' right to privacy and a violation of California Penal Code § 630, et seq., did intrude on Plaintiff and the members of The Class' privacy by knowingly and/or negligently and/or intentionally engaging in the aforementioned intercepting, eavesdropping, wire-tapping, listening, and recording activities relative to the telephone conversations between Plaintiff and The Class members, on the one hand, and Defendant on the other hand, as alleged herein above.
- 35. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff and the members of The Class are entitled to, and below herein do pray for, their statutory remedies and damages, including but not limited to, those set forth in California Penal Code § 637.2.
- 36. Because this case is brought for the purposes of enforcing important rights affecting the public interest, Plaintiff and The Class seek recovery of their attorney's fees pursuant to the private attorney general doctrine codified in Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, or any other statutory basis.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION INVASION OF PRIVACY: COMMON LAW

37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 38. Defendant invaded Plaintiff and the members of The Class' right to privacy by intentionally allowing the unauthorized eavesdropping, wiretapping, recording, and listening of the telephone conversation with Plaintiff and the members of The Class and negligently maintaining the confidentiality of the information of Plaintiff and the members of The Class, as set for above.
- 39. The intrusion through the unauthorized eavesdropping, wiretapping, recording, and listening of the telephone conversations with Plaintiff and the members of The Class and the negligently maintaining of the confidentiality of the information of Plaintiff and The Class, was offensive and objectionable to Plaintiff, the Class, and to a reasonable person of ordinary sensibilities.
- 40. The intrusion was into a place or thing which was private and which is entitled to be private, in that Plaintiff and The Class' personal conversations and information provided to Defendant were made privately, were intended not to be recorded, and were intended to be kept confidential and protected from unauthorized disclosure.
- As a proximate result of Defendant's above acts, Plaintiff and The Class' 41. personal conversations and information were intentionally wire-tapped, eavesdropped, recorded, and listened to, and then distributed and used by persons without prior written authorization, and Plaintiff and The Class suffered general damages in an amount to be determined at trial according to proof.
- Defendant is guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice by permitting and 42. intentionally wire-tapping, eavesdropping, recording, and listening to Plaintiff and The Class' personal conversations and information with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff and The Class' right to privacy.
- 43. Unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this Court, Defendant's wrongful conduct will continue to cause Plaintiff and The Class great and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

irreparable injury in that the personal information maintained by Defendant can be distributed and used by unauthorized persons. Plaintiff and members of The Class have no adequate remedy at law for the injuries in that a judgment for monetary sanctions will not end the invasion of privacy for Plaintiff and The Class.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENCE

- 44. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 45. Defendant, as aforesaid herein, has various statutory and common law duties not to engage in the aforementioned wire-tapping, eavesdropping, recording, and listening conduct such that Plaintiff and The Class' rights to privacy were invaded and breached.
- Defendant negligently and recklessly engages in the aforementioned 46. eavesdropping, wiretapping, recording, and listening conduct of Plaintiff and The Class.
- 47. These activities of Defendant as aforesaid in this cause of action and in this Complaint, legally caused actual, statutorily-imposed and/or demonstrable damages to Plaintiff and The Class.
- As a result of Defendant's activities as aforesaid in this cause of action and 48. Complaint, Plaintiff and The Class suffered damage as a result of the conduct of Defendant. Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to their damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNLAWFUL, FRAUDULENT AND UNFAIR BUSINESS ACTS AND PRACTICES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200, ET SEQ.

- 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- As a result of Defendant's violations of California Penal Code §§ 631(a) and/or 632.6(a), as set forth above, and Defendant's violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, as set forth below, Plaintiff and The Class have suffered an injury in fact by, among other things, having their personal information recorded without their prior permission or consent, as required by California Penal Code § 630 *et seq*. Additionally, Plaintiff and The Class have lost property in that Plaintiff and The Class suffered and are each entitled to the greater of statutory damages of \$5,000 per violation pursuant to Penal Code § 637.2(a), or three times actual damages per violation pursuant to Penal Code § 637.2(a).
- 51. Defendant's conduct in violation of California Penal Code §§ 631(a) and/or 632.6(a), as set forth above, violates California Business and Professions Code § 17200 in the following respects:
 - a. Defendant's conduct of overhearing, recording, and listening to each and every incoming and outgoing telephone conversation with Plaintiff and The Class without their prior consent, as set forth above, constitutes an unlawful business practice because Defendant's conduct violates California Penal Code §§ 631(a) and/or 632.6(a); and
 - b. Defendant's conduct of overhearing, recording, and listening to each and every incoming and outgoing telephone conversation with Plaintiff and The Class without their prior consent, as set forth above, constitutes an unfair business practice because Defendant's practice is unethical, unscrupulous, and substantially injurious to consumers. The harm to Plaintiff and the members of The Class outweighs the utility, if any, of Defendant's practices.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20 21

22 23

24

2.5

26 27

28

- 52. Defendant's unlawful and unfair business practices, as described above, present a continuing threat to Plaintiff and the Class since Defendant continues to overhear, record, and listen to each and every incoming and outgoing telephone conversation with California residents, including Plaintiff and The Class without their prior consent. Plaintiff and The Class have no other adequate remedy of law in that absent equitable relief from the Court, Defendant is likely to continue to injure California residents, and thus engendering a multiplicity of judicial proceedings.
- Pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff and The Class 53. seek an order of this Court for equitable and/or injunctive relief in the form of an order instructing Defendant to prohibit the overhearing, recording, and listening to of each and every incoming and outgoing telephone conversation with California residents, including Plaintiff and The Class without their prior consent and to maintain the confidentiality of the information of Plaintiff and The Class. Plaintiff and The Class also seek the recovery of attorney's fees and costs in prosecuting this action against Defendant under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff and The Class members the following relief against Defendant:

- 1. That this action be certified as a class action on behalf of The Class and Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of The Class;
- 2. For the greater of statutory damages of \$5,000 per violation or three times actual damage per violation pursuant to Penal Code § 637.2(a) for Plaintiff and each member of The Class;
- 3. Injunctive relief in the form of an order requiring Defendant to disgorge all ill-gotten gains and awarding Plaintiff and The Class full restitution of all monies wrongfully acquired by Defendant by means of such unfair and

unlawful conduct;

2.5

- 4. That the Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant from overhearing, recording, and listening to each and every oncoming and outgoing telephone conversation with California resident, including Plaintiff and The Class, without their prior consent, as required by California Penal Code § 630, *et seq.*, and to maintain the confidentiality of the information of Plaintiff and The Class;
 - 5. For statutory damages per statute;
 - 6. For general damages according to proof;
 - 7. For special damages according to proof;
 - 8. For exemplary or punitive damages;
 - 9. For costs of suit;
 - 10. For prejudgment interest at the legal rate; and
 - 11. For such further relief as this Court deems necessary, just, and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Date: December 19, 2011 Kazerouni Law Group, APC

By: _/s Abbas Kazerounian Abbas Kazerounian

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

Case 3:11-cv-02938-JM-L Pocuments-Filed 12/19/11 Page 15 of 16

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE I	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)								
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDA	DEFENDANTS						
Pari Iranmanesh, Individ Situated	dually and on Behalf of all Others Sim	ilarly Executive	Executive Financial Enterprises, Inc.						
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	_	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant						
	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	ONLY)					
		NOTE:	IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, U LAND INVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	e, Address, and Telephone Number)	Attorneys (If I	Known)						
Hyde & Swigart			'11 CV2938 JN	1 JMA					
	South Suite 301, San Diego, CA 9210								
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	(For Diversity Case	OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)					
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	PTF DEF □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Proof Business In Th	rincipal Place					
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State							
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In	Another State					
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6					
	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)								
CONTRACT	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR	FORFEITURE/PEN		OTHER STATUTES					
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury	- U	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust					
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractic	ce	zure 28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking					
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 365 Personal Injury 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability		PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation					
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander 368 Asbestos Person	al 540 R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and					
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product Liability Liability	☐ 650 Airline Regs. ☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit					
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER	RTY Safety/Health		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV					
(Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending	☐ 690 Other LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	□ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/					
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standa	ards	Exchange					
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Damage		□ 862 Black Lung (923) ations □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	□ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410					
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability	☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Rep	orting 364 SSID Title XVI	■ 890 Other Statutory Actions					
☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO	& Disclosure Act NS 740 Railway Labor A	□ 865 RSI (405(g)) ct FEDERAL TAX SUITS	□ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act					
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca			□ 893 Environmental Matters					
☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 442 Employment Sentence	☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	□ 894 Energy Allocation Act□ 895 Freedom of Information					
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: Accommodations ☐ 530 General	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act					
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATIO		☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination					
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot Employment ☐ 550 Civil Rights	ther 462 Naturalization Ap 463 Habeas Corpus -	optication	Under Equal Access to Justice					
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 555 Prison Condition	Alien Detainee		☐ 950 Constitutionality of					
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 465 Other Immigratio Actions	n	State Statutes					
又 1 Original □ 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	4 Reinstated or 5 Reopened	another district Litigation						
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a California Penal Code 630 et se	are filing (Do not cite juris	(specify) sdictional statutes unless diversity):						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Invation of Privacy	,q. 20.1001 1LB							
VII. REQUESTED IN	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION		CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:					
COMPLAINT:		5,000,001+	JURY DEMAND	: ✓ Yes □ No					
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER						
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY OF RECORD							
12/19/11	s/Abbas Kazer	ounian							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT#	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP	Л	JDGE MAG. JU	JDGE					

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

- Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553
 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service unless diversity.
- Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.